

Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary	Application No. 10/046,468	Applicant(s) DEMPSKI, KELLY L.
	Examiner Uchendu O Anyaso	Art Unit 2675

All Participants:**Status of Application:** After-Final Rejection(1) Uchendu O Anyaso.

(3) _____.

(2) Joseph W. Flerlage.

(4) _____.

Date of Interview: 16 April 2004**Time:** 12 noon**Type of Interview:**

- Telephonic
 Video Conference
 Personal (Copy given to: Applicant Applicant's representative)

Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: Yes No

If Yes, provide a brief description:

Part I.**Rejection(s) discussed:**

Claim 14 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Beller (U.S. 6,046,712); and Claims 1 and 10 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Beller (U.S. 6,046,712) in view of Ohshima (U.S. 6,522,312)

Claims discussed:

1, 10 and 14

Prior art documents discussed:*Beller et al (US 6,046,712) and Ohshima et al (US 6,522,312)***Part II.****SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:**

See Continuation Sheet

Part III.

- It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.
 It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.

(Examiner/SPE Signature)

(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: Applicant's Representative contends that applicant's invention is distinguishable over Beller because the computer system in applicant's invention has logic that is capable of automatically detecting one or more visual marks. This, according to Applicant's Rep., is different from Beller in that the operator has to add marks to the real time image depicted on the display so as to identify the image. Applicant's Rep. further contends that the computer logic is what determines the identifier. Examiner noted Applicant's Reps. arguments. Examiner informed Applicant's Rep. to respond to the outstanding Office Action mailed on February 11, 2004. Examiner shall review applicant's arguments and the references cited, and then conduct further consideration and/or search to determine patentability. .